DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 556 SP 013 046

TITLE	Evaluation of the Chelmsford Title I Program "Project Independence", 1977-1978.
INSTITUTION	Merrimack Education Center, Chelmsford, Mass.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	38p.; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Academic Enrichment; *Elementary Education; Individualized Instruction; *Mathematics; *Program Evaluation; *Reading; Small Group Instruction; Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

Project Independence was established as a Title I program to improve the academic status of elementary school students with special emphasis on reading and mathematics skills. The project classrooms were organized as resource rooms with students entering from a regular classroom with a set schedule and time for the week. For each child in the program, the staff planned and implemented a personal learning prescription based upon the specific needs of the child. The student received assistance on a one-to-one, as well as small group, basis. The report presents an evaltation of the program for the academic year 1977-78. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160556

EVALUATION OF THE CHELMSFORD TITLE I PROGRAM "PROJECT INDEPENDENCE"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1977 TO 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUBMITTED BY: Merrimack Education Center
101 Mill Road
Chelmsford, Ma. 01824

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Merrimack Education Center
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

SP013 046

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE ---------- 1
INTRODUCTION ---------- 2
PROGRAM OVERVIEW ---------- 3
EVALUATION DESIGN ---------- 4
CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS ---------- 5
ARTICULATION WITH TITLE I STAFF ---------- 6
HOME/SCHOOL - ANALYSIS OF COGNITIVE RESULTS ---------- 7
READING OBJECTIVES MASTERED BY STUDENTS ---------- 8
ACHIEVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS ---------- 9
COMMENDATIONS ----------10
PART B ---------- 11-14
RECOMMENDATIONS ---------- 15
TITLE III-ESEA- ANNUAL REPORT ---------- 16
TITLE III-ANNUAL REPORT ----------17-35

PREFACE

In 1975 the Chelmsford Public Schools initiated a Title I Program designed to assist children who qualified under the guidelines set forth by Title I, E.S.E.A. In its beginning, this venture was limited to a one site summer program which lasted approximately five weeks. Since that time, Project Independence has expanded to a full school year program for students in kindergarten through grade six.

The project includes a variety of components which facilitate the individualization of instruction with the ultimate goal being the improvement of the academic status of the children involved, as well as the reinforcement of the self-concept of those same students.

The program was in compliance with all rules and regulations set forth by the Congress in Title I, E.S.E.A.

I. INTRODUCTION

The following is an evaluation report of the E.S.E.A. Title I Program, Project Independence, conducted by the Chelmsford Public Schools during the academic year 1977-78. This was the third year of the Title I program in Chelmsford and was budgeted for $87,457.00. The goals of the program were:

1. To produce a measurable effect on pupils' growth in reading.
2. To produce a measurable effect on pupils' growth in mathematics.
3. To design and implement an individualized instruction program.
4. To diagnose each student in order to identify reading and/or mathematics objectives for that student and to write appropriate learning prescriptions.
5. To provide reinforcement and feedback to each student so that they are made aware of their successes rather than their failures.
6. To provide learning experiences for individual students that will enable the student to work at his/her own pace and his/her own level.
7. To provide interesting material to the students in motivating formats.

II. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

In the past, Project Independence was a program which served grades K-4 in the Westlands and North Schools in Chelmsford, Massachusetts. This year an additional component, covering the fifth and sixth grade, were included as a part of Project Independence. The fifth and sixth grade components referred to as part "B" (the K-4 component was referred to as part "A") was conducted with the specific purpose of improving reading skills.

Project Independence began the school year in September of 1977 with some 130 students. During the academic year, 217 children participated in the program.

Table 1 contains the summary of the number of pupils and their grade level.

TABLE 1

GRADE	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total*
NO. OF STUDENTS	38	51	41	27	19	31	10	217

*North and Westlands Schools.

The project "classrooms" were organized as resource rooms with students entering from a "regular" classroom with a set schedule and time for the week. A full-time student would attend five times per week for forty-five minutes per day. Some students, because of scheduling difficulties, would attend for less than the full five periods.

For each child in the Project Independence program, the staff would plan and implement a personal learning prescription based upon the specific need of each child. The student would receive assistance on a one-one, as well as small group basis.

EVALUATION DESIGN

The following procedures were undertaken in the evaluation of the project:

1. Periodic on-site visitations by the evaluators.
2. Analysis of cognitive results of pre and post assessment in the areas of reading and mathematics.
3. Interviews of staff and students from the project to determine growth in the affective domain, specifically in the self-concepts of the students.

The program staff of twelve worked efficiently and effectively as a team. The roles and number of staff in each role are listed.

TITLE I STAFF

Director	1
Home/School Coordinator	1
Classroom Teachers	6
Instructional Aides	3
Clerical Aide	1

III. CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

In observing the classrooms involved with Project Independence, it was evident that a real diversity of learning programs for each individual child was being implemented. A great deal of one-to-one and small group instruction was observed with "teacher-made" materials, as well as professionally developed materials utilized against academic objectives.

A management system was used that would provide teachers and students evidence of growth and served as a basis for instructional planning with one exception explained later.

The classrooms were bright and inviting with many examples of children's work displayed. Much effort by the staff has gone to make the North School Teaching/learning area a motivating environment for the students. At the Westlands School the staff maintains a very adequate area on the stage. This is a very large, roomy space.

The only concern that should be reported is the space provided for the North grade five students. This area proved less than adequate. Although the Title I staff had done their very best to provide a positive atmosphere, the physical location and constraints of the corridor space are difficult to overcome. The normal amount of traffic in the corridor proved to be distracting for the students.

IV. ARTICULATION WITH TITLE I STAFF AND PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

The teachers and director of the Title I program have done an excellent job of maintaining communication links between the regular classroom teacher and the Title I staff. In fact, one of the major strengths of Project Independence has been the strong interrelationships built in each of the schools between the regular classroom teacher and the Title I teacher.

Within the Title I staff itself, a team approval is utilized effectively. Weekly staff meetings along with daily planning sessions of the team helps insure that decisions affecting students are quality decisions.

V. KINDERGARTEN

In the Kindergarten program, the students were given a pre-assessment in areas including: social development, eye-hand coordination, perception of direction, work habits, language development, and reading readiness. Individual prescriptions were then written for each child and an instructional program set to help the child attain the stated goals. Results of the instructional program were measured by observing and recording performance tasks. The children were asked to do certain tasks and the teachers recorded the results. In reviewing the evaluative process, it was concluded that the students did attain the objectives identified in the individual prescriptions.

VI. HOME/SCHOOL

The Parent Advisory Committee was an active group, meeting formally no less than eleven times during the school year. In addition, the P.A.C. sponsored in each building a "Parents Day" during the month of May. Parents have also displayed a great deal of enthusiasm through their informal comments and their participation in activities offered by the project.

VII. ANALYSIS OF COGNITIVE RESULTS

Academic gain in mathematics were determined through the use of the Stanford Test. Gain in reading skills are shown by the number of objectives attained as measured by the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skills Tests in the Word Attack Component. The Wisconsin Program contains a listing of specific skills which set objectives for the children in the Skills Development Program. The Word Attack Component has some 45 skills which should be accomplished by the end of what is the traditional grade three. The skills are further divided into expectations by grade levels, by the average student as follows: Seven basic skills at Kindergarten, 13 at grade one, 18 at grade two, and the remaining 7 skills by the end of grade three. Identification of student achievement was accomplished by means of a criterion-referenced, pre-assessment. Mastery of a given skill or group of skills was measured by the criterion-referenced post-assessment.

Evaluation and assessment in Project Independence was used to identify needs through the pre-assessment plan. A suitable instructional program was then determined. Through the post-assessment, the degree of mastery was determined, insuring a systematic, effective process of teaching and learning.

VIII. READING OBJECTIVES MASTERED BY STUDENTS

Table 2 indicates the percentage of students who mastered at least the number of objectives listed in the column on the left.

TABLE 2

Number of new skills mastered 1977-78	Percentage of students
1	100.0%
2	97.3%
3	93.4%
4	72.2%
5	53.6%
6	35.8%
7	24.5%
8	15.9%
9	17.9%
10	4.6%
11	1.3%
12	1.3%
13	1.3%
14	1.3%
15	1.3%
16	1.3%

X. ACHIEVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS

Table 3 shows the grade equivalents gain in mathematics by students in grades 1-4.

The majority of students gained at least the expectations of national norms and in some instances outdistanced the national norms.

TABLE 3

Grade	N	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Average Gain
1	39	0.7	2.2	+1.5
2	35	2.1	3.6	+1.5
3	26	2.2	4.9	+2.7
4	13	3.2	4.2	+1.0

In Table 4 the percentage of students who experienced some gain in mathematics is reported. At every level the number that gained exceeded 90% of the students involved.

TABLE 4

Grade	N	Percentage of Students Showing Gain	Loss	Unchanged
1	39	97.7	0.0	2.3
2	35	90.3	6.5	3.2
3	26	100.0	0.0	0.0
4	13	93.3	0.0	6.7

XI. COMMENDATIONS

1. The Title I team, which included the director, the teaching staff, and home/school coordinator, worked together very well and were effective in accomplishing the stated objectives.

2. There was substantial growth by the students in reading and mathematics.

3. The Home/School Program was well received by parents. It linked the parents with the school helping to maintain an environment that influenced the whole child.

4. The staff maintained a positive learning atmosphere for the students of Project Independence. Children were allowed the flexibility to learn, and were encouraged in their development.

5. Open lines of communications between the regular staff and the Title I staff were maintained regularly to benefit the student.

6. The Title I staff was knowledgeable in the area of individualized instruction and was effective in its implementation.

7. The Project Independence staff had a great deal of empathy for both students and parents and was able to build effective relationships with both groups.

8. The director has continued to provide leadership in the progress of Project Independence.

PART B

Chelmsford Project Independence has developed a successful program to provide for instructional needs in reading and mathematics K-4. Part B extends this program to grades five and six in the North and Westlands districts.

Through use of high-interest materials, individualized instruction based upon careful diagnosis, innovative methods, and low pupil-teacher ratio, the program would hope to establish an interest in reading and to restore a feeling of success in the students at this grade level.

Part B was staffed with a teacher and two instructional aides who were supervised by the Title I Director. The staff served students in grades five and six in the North and Westlands School districts.

The program began in February, 1978 and operated through the end of the 1977-78 school year. A total of forty students participated in the program on a daily schedule of forty-five minute periods.

While formal data on attitude was not collected, the evaluator did observe the students in small group activity. The students were attentive and responded to directions and questions from the staff. Each student prepared a fifty-page summer activity booklet to use to reinforce skills mastered over the last five months.

The parents of the students were kept informed of the progress of their child through regular reports to the home and a parent day we held in June.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

1. To continue the program started in K-4 on through grades 5 and 6 in order to provide a firm skills basis for the future
2. To produce a measurable effect on pupils' growth in reading.
3. To diagnose, design, and implement an individualized instructional program.
4. To create an awareness for the need of the reading skills for the students' future use.
5. To build a better self-image which is often low by this age group.
6. To provide interesting materials with which to interest the students to better performance.
7. To provide appropriate learning prescriptions to help correct the diagnosed needs.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

1. 10-15 students were scheduled into the resource room for an instructional period.
2. The resource team consisted of one teacher and two instructional aides.
3. Auxiliary personnel from the school system were utilized to provide specialized services.
4. The learning program was based upon:
    a. Careful diagnosis.
    b. Diversified activities to allow differences in rate of learning interest, ability and learning styles of the pupil.
5. A home-school program was developed to encourage parent involvement and provide information releases and encourage parental activities.

EVALUATION

In the K-4 program, students concentrate on the mastery of word attack skills in reading. Based upon need of students in grades 5-6, the emphasis was on the development of reading comprehension skills.

Using the Wisconsin Basic Skills Reading Program, a student may proceed through three levels of the comprehension program. The progress of a student may be measured by comparing the number of skill levels mastered at the end of the program. All skill levels are measured through criterion-referenced statements and mastery is considered if 80% of a particular skill level is answered correctly.

In grade five, 32 students participated in the Title I program. Table 5 shows that these students, on an aggregate, displayed mastery of 99 level sub-tests. The fifth grade students increased this aggregate total by 90% within five months; each student, on the average, was able to master an additional 3 sub-level sets of comprehension objectives.

In grade six, 8 students had mastered, in an aggregate, 25 level sub-tests in February and had increased this aggregate to 49 in June. This was an increase in mastery of comprehension skills of 96%.

TABLE 5

Mastery of Reading Comprehension:
Tests by Grade 5 and 6 Students

Grade Level	N	No. of Tests Mastered Pre-Test	Post-Test	Total	% of Increase
5	52	99	89	198	90
6	8	25	24	49	96

Table 6 shows the number of additional sub-tests mastered by students in grades five and six. In grade five, 81% of the students increased by 100% the number of tests mastered in reading comprehension. In grade six, 88% of the students increased their mastery level by 100%. Most students gained mastery in at least three additional sub-levels of the reading comprehension program.

TABLE 6

Number of Additional Sub-Tests
Mastered in Reading Comprehension
by Students in Grades 5 and 6

Number of Additional Tests Mastered	Grade 5	Grade 6
7	1	0
6	0	0
5	4	1
4	2	2
3	10	2
2	10	2
1	4	1
0	1	0

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In addition to measuring student growth in reading through the Wisconsin Design Skill Tests, consideration should be given to using an appropriate standardized reading achievement test in conjunction with the Stanford Mathematics Test.

2. The project staff should continue to emphasize basic skill development in K-4 and that if service choices need to be made, priority be given to this group.

ANNUAL REPORT -ESEA TITLE I

SCHOOL YEAR 1978

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

31 St. James Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

ANNUAL REPORT - ESEA TITLE I

SCHOOL YEAR 1978

Projects which operated in the period
September 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978

PART II: TITLE I PROJECT REPORT

This questionnaire is to be completed separately for each Title I project that your school district conducted during the 1978 school year program either independently or as fiscal agent for a cooperative project. Three copies should be returned to the Department of Education; one copy is for your files. Reports should be returned within ten days of the conclusion of the program.

The questionnaire is designed so that non-narrative responses can be key-punched. The parenthetical numbers in the page margins are to facilitate that process. Please disregard them as you fill out the report.

Project Numbers During the School Year

Chelmsford
(School District)

78-056-165

Leslie C. Bernal, Ed.D.
(Name of person completing this report)

6-26-78
(Date)

Please return the completed questionnaire to:

Mr. Richard Zusman, Evaluation Specialist
Department of Education, Title I Office
31 St. James Avenue, Room 536
Boston, MA 02116

PART II: TITLE I PROJECT REPORT

School District: Chelmsford Public Schools
(Fiscal Agent)

78-056-165 Title I Project Number

1. Was this a cooperative project with other school districts?

(1) _____ Yes

(2) ___X___ No

2. If this was a cooperative project, list the names of all the school systems that participated, including the school district that acted as fiscal agent.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

3. Total unduplicated count of public and non-public school children.

GRADE	NUMBER
Pre-Kindergarten	
Kindergarten	38
1	51
2	41
3	27
4	19
5	31
6	10
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Special Ed. Classes	
Drop-Outs	
Other (Specify)	
Total	217

4 Total Project Participants - Duplicated Count

Give a count of the number of children who participated in this Title I project. Children in non-graded classes should be entered at their grade equivalents.

Line No.	(A) GRADE	(B) PUBLIC	(C) NON-PUBLIC	(D) TOTAL
01	Pre-Kindergarten			
02	Kindergarten			
03				
04				
05				
06				
07				
08				
09				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15	Special Ed. Classes			
16	Drop-Outs			
17	Others (Specify)			
18	Total			

5. Project activities and expenditures for each activity.

For the instructional activities listed below, indicate the number of children involved in each activity and the average estimated percent of your total expenditure for each project activity.

Project Activity	Total Of Children Involved	Percent of Total Title I Participants (Duplicated Count)	Average Estimated Percent Of Total Expenditures*
Reading	217	100%	50%
Cultural Enrichment	217	100%	5%
Food or Clothing Services			
Diagnosis of Learning or Emotional Problems	217	100%	10%
Mathematics	176	81%	20%
Crafts, Art, Music or Dramatics			
Physical Education or Recreation			
Social and Emotional Development	217	100%	5%
Science			
Medical and Dental Services			
Other Language Arts	217	100%	10%
Social Studies			
English as a Second Language			
Speech and Hearing			
Other Academic Areas			
Industrial Arts			
Home Economics			
Business Education			
Other			

6. Non-Public School Participation:

6a. Were there non-public school children in your project area who were eligible to participate in this project? (CHECK ONE)

(1)____Yes, and all those eligible did participate

(2)____Yes, and some of them participated

(3)____Yes, but none of them participated

(4)____No, no non-public school children were eligible

6b. In what ways were non-public school representatives involved in the Title I project activities? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1)____In planning project design

(2)____In planning curriculum and materials

(3)____In project instruction and services

(4)____In staff training

(5)____In evaluation

(6)____Other (Specify) Selection of participants

6c. When did the participation of non-public school children begin? (CHECK ONE)

(1)____At the beginning of the project and at the same time as the public school children

(2)____Near the beginning of the project but later than the public school children

(3)____About halfway through the project

(4)____When more than half the project term was over

6d. When did the project activities for non-public school children take place? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1)____During the regular or summer school day

(2)____Before the regular or summer school day

(3)____After the regular or summer school day

(4)____On weekends

(5)____Other, (Specify):

6e. Where did the project activities for non-public school children principally take place? (CHECK ONE)

(1) X Public school grounds only

(2) ____ Non-public school grounds only

(3) ____ Both public and non-public school grounds

(4) ____ Other than public or non-public school grounds (Specify):

7. Staff training:

7a. Was a staff training program operated in conjunction with this project? (CHECK ONE)

(1) X Yes, Title I funded

(2) ____ Yes, funded by the school system

(3) ____ Yes, funded jointly by Title I and the system

(4) ____ No, but staff training was provided during a previous project year

(5) ____ No, there was no staff training program

(6) ____ Other, (Specify):

7b. For whom was the staff training operated? (CHECK ONE)

(1) ____ Teachers and professional staff only

(2) ____ Teacher aides only

(3) ____ Teachers and teacher aides separately

(4) X Teachers and teacher aides jointly

(5) ____ Other, (Specify):

7c. Estimate the number of hours of staff training that the average participant received. (CHECK ONE)

(1) ____ 1-5 hours

(2) ____ 6-10

(3) X 11-15

(4) ____ 16-20

(5) ____ 21-30

(6) ____ 31-40

(7) ____ Over 40

7d. When was the staff training conducted? (CHECK ONE)

(1) X Prior to and during the project

(2) ____ Prior to the project activities only

(3) ____ During the project only

(4) ____ Other, (Specify):

7e. Who conducted the staff training? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1) X Project director

(2) X Local teachers and staff specialists

(3) ____ Specialists from colleges and universities

(4) ____ Specialists from industry and/or the arts

(5) ____ Specialists in medical and psychological services

(6) X Others, (Specify): (Staffs from other education agencies)

7f. What were the major topics of the staff training program for teachers and professional staff? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1) X Orientation to the Title I project

(2) X Project planning and design

(3) X Subject matter areas

(4) X Development of curriculum and teaching materials

(5) ____ Use of equipment and materials

(6) ____ Use of supportive services (counseling, medical, etc.)

(7) ____ Culture and psychology of the educationally disadvantaged

(8) X Diagnosis of learning disabilities

(9) X Measurement, evaluation, and reporting

(10) X Use and duties of teacher aides

(11) ____ Other, (Specify):

7g. What were the major topics of the staff training program for teacher aides and other non-professional staff? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

(1) X Orientation to the Title I project

(2) X Project planning and design

(3) X Subject matter areas

(4) X Development of curriculum and teaching materials

(5) X Use of equipment and materials

(6) ___ Use of supportive services (counseling, medical, etc.)

(7) ___ Culture and psychology of the educationally disadvantaged

(8) x Diagnosis of learning disabilities

(9) X Measurement, evaluation, and reporting

(10) X Use and duties of teacher aides

(11) __ Other, (Specify):

7h. Enter the number of staff members who received training

(1) 6 Teachers and other professional staff

(2) 2 Teacher aides and other non-professional staff

7i. Staff Participation

Enter the number of people who worked on this Title I project in the following ways:

FULL TIME= For the summer projects, full school day for duration of the project

PART-TIME= For the summer projects, part of the school day for all or part of the project; or full school day for part of the project

A = Salaried
B = Unpaid Volunteer

LINE NO.	POSITION	FULL-TIME A	FULL-TIME B	FULL-TIME Total	PART-TIME A	PART-TIME B	PART-TIME Total	TOTAL
01	Pre-Kindergarten Teachers							
02	Kindergarten Teachers							
03	Elementary Teachers	6		6				6
04	Secondary Teachers							
05	Special Ed. Teachers							
06	Reading Specialists							
07	Speech Therapist							
08	Librarians							
09	Supervisors and Administrators	1		1				1
10	Counselors and Psychologists							
11	Attendance and Social Workers							
12	Physicians and Nurses							
13	Teacher Aides	3		3				3
14	Library Aides							
15	Other (Specify): ~~XXXXXXXXX~~ (Home/School)				1		1	1/2
16	Total							10 1/2

8. Title I Advisory Council:

Reminder: Please complete this section only with regard to the specific project for which this report is being prepared.

8a. Did this project have a Title I Parent Advisory Council during school year 1978?

(1) X Yes

(2) ____ No

8b. Are all of the parents who are voting members in the council, parents of children attending a Title I school in the 1977-1978 school year?

(1) X Yes

(2) ____ No

(3) ____ No parents involved as voting members

8c. Were all of the parents who are voting members elected to their positions on the council by parents of children attending a Title I school?

(1) ____ Yes

(2) X No

(3) ____ No parents involved as voting members

8d. Are parent advisory councils being organized for each Title I school?

(1) X Yes

(2) ____ No

8e. What was the number of parents on the Parent Advisory Council?

(1) 11

8e. Indicate other groups who served ex officio as non-voting members on the Title I Advisory Council. (Check all that apply - numbers not required.)

(1) __X__ Parents of public school children served by the Title I project

(2) ____ Parents of th: non-public school children served by the Title I project

(3) ____ Parents of public school children not served by the Title I project

(4) ____ Parents of non-public school children not served by the Title I project

(5) ____ Public school administrators

(6) ____ Non-public school administrators

(7) __X__ Teachers (Public)

(8) ____ Teachers (Non-public)

(9) ____ School committee member

(10) ____ Anti-poverty program representatives (Headstart, Follow Through, Neighborhood Youth Corps, CAA.)

(11) ____ Service Club representatives

(12) ____ Students

(13) ____ Others, (Specify):

8e. Did the council for this project serve as the advisory council for more than one project during FY 78?

(1) ____ Yes

(2) __X__ No

8e-1 If yes, how many projects?_____

8f. Below are listed nine activities in which advisory councils may participate. Rank the activities in which your council was involved in the order of effort that the council devoted to each activity. Place a 1 before the activity to which the council alloted most effort; a 2 before the next, etc., to the activity which required least attention. Rank only those activities in which the council participated. You do not have to rank all nine activities.

(1) 6 Recommending direction for the overall Title I effort in the district.

(2) 1 Recommending direction for this specific project in the total program

(3) 3 Reviewing project plans developed by the school

(4) 5 Initiating specific plans for the project's activities

(5) 4 Identifying the needs of children to be served

(6) ___ Mobilizing personnel and community resources (Teacher aides, volunteers, service agencies, etc.)

(7) 2 Disseminating information on Title I activities

(8) ___ Evaluation of existing projects

(9) ___ Participating in personnel policy decisions

(10) ___ Other, (Specify):

8g. How many meetings were held during FY 78 which all members of the Title I Advisory Council were asked to attend?

9 Enter number

8h. Did the Parent Advisory Council review the application before it was submitted to the State Department of Education?

(1) X Yes

(2) ___ No

9. State Department Assistance

9a. In what areas has your project received assistance from the State Department? For each area below, please indicate the adequacy of that assistance if assistance was received.

(I) Understanding the intent of Title I

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(II) Interpretation of Title I Federal and State regulations and guidelines

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(III) Needs Assessment

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(IV) Program Planning

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(V) Program Operations

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(VI) Evaluation

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(VII) Training of project personnel

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(VIII) Parent Involvement

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(IX) Proposal development

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(X) Fiscal Accounting

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

(IX) Other (Please specify)

(1)____Adequate (2)____Inadequate

9b. Below are listed 10 areas in which the State Department can be of assistance to you. Rank order the areas in which you would like the State Department to give you more assistance. Rank only these areas in which you want more assistance. You need not rank all 10 areas.

I____	Understanding the intent of Title I
II 1	Interpretation of Title I Federal and State regulations and guidelines
III 2	Needs Assessment
IV____	Program planning
V____	Program operations
VI____	Evaluation
VII____	Training of project personnel
VIII____	Parent involvement
IX____	Proposal development
X____	Fiscal accounting
XI____	Other (Please specify):

10. Achievement Data Results

A. For each skill area evaluated for each project, please complete the form on the following page. Be sure to use a separate sheet for each skill area. A worksheet is included to assist the completion of the achievement data.

NAME OF LEA: enter the name of the school system.

PROJECT NUMBER: enter the eight-digit project number.

SKILL AREA: enter the name of the skill area (e.g., Reading, Math, Social Studies).

Ignore the box marked "For Dept. of Ed. use only."

TIME OF YEAR: place an "X" either by "Regular School Year" or "Summer School."

LENGTH OF PROJECT: enter the number of weeks from the project's beginning to its end.

AMOUNT OF PROJECT EXPOSURE PER STUDENT EACH WEEK: enter the average amount of time that a child spends each week in the project. Express the figure in hours and minutes; for example, if the average amount of time is one and a quarter hours, enter "1" under "hours" and "15" under "minutes."

NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED: enter an unduplicated count of the children served by the project.

TOTAL HOURS OF STUDENT EXPOSURE: Multiply the number of children served by the average amount of project exposure; round off the answer to the nearest hours.

INSTRUCTOR/PUPIL RATIO: When computing this figure anyone who functions in an instructional capacity should be counted as an instructor. In calculating the ratio, consider only the time during which the student is actually participating in the project. For example, if a project consists of an aide tutoring each child individually for 30 minutes a day, the instructor-pupil ratio is 1.0 although the aide may tutor several children each day. Enter the ratio as a decimal rounded off to the nearest tenth.

TOTAL PROJECT COST: Include all money spent on project children which is above and beyond the per-pupil expenditure for the regular school program.

COST PER PUPIL: Compute this by dividing the total project cost by the number of children served.

B. For additional measures, other than standardized tests which report equivalent scores used in evaluation of your project (e.g., teacher-made tests, attitude scales, criterion referenced tests, attendance, etc.): summarize the results briefly in narrative form; include appropriate tables of results and attach to this report.

C. In addition, please send two copies of the final evaluation report along with Part II to the Title I Office, Room 536, 31 St. James Avenue, Boston, MA 02116, and one copy to your educational specialist in their regional office.

TEST RESULTS: enter the results of pretests and posttests in the spaces indicated.

GRADE: enter the grade for which test results are reported.

NAME, LEVEL AND FORM OF TEST: enter the name of the test used. The same test, same level and same form should be used for both pretest and posttest. If more than one pre and posttest area used, list them separately.

TEST CODE: Ignore this box, it is for Department of Education use only.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN TAKING TESTS: enter the number of students with both pretest and posttest. If the total number of students reported with both pretest and posttest is more than 75% of the project participants, the data can be considered representative. Otherwise, the SEA should be instructed that the data are not suitable for aggregation.

DATE OF TEST: enter the date of each test, using the formate month/day/year; for example, 10/1/77 for October 1, 1977. Where possible, it is strongly recommended that tests be administered within two weeks of the actual norming date of the test used.

MEAN STANDARD SCORE, MEAN PERCENTILE SCORE, MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORE: A worksheet is attached to assist the computation of these items. Do not submit worksheet, but retain in project files. To compute the mean standard score: (1) list the pretest and posttest raw score for each student in that grade with both pretest and posttest scores; (2) convert the raw score to standard score using the appropriate conversion table for raw score to standard score coversion; (3) add all the standard scores; (4) divide this sum by the number of students to obtain the mean standard score; (5) using the appropriate standard score to percentile score table, and the standard score to grade equivalent score table, convert the mean standard score to mean percentile score and mean grade equivalent score.

GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN: To compute this item, subtract the mean pretest grade equivalent score from the mean posttest grade equivalent score.

Massachusetts Department of Education TITLE I A ACHIEVEMENT DATA	A. NAME OF LEA Chelmsville	B. PROJECT NUMBER 78-056-165 1-8	C. SKILL AREA Reading/Math Social Growth	For Dept. of Ed. use only 9

D. TYPE OF TERM (check one) ☐ 1 Regular School Year ☐ 2 Summer School 11	E. LENGTH OF PROJECT (in weeks) 32 13-14	F. AMOUNT OF PROJECT EXPOSURE PER STUDENT EACH WEEK Hours: — Minutes: 45 15 / 16-17	G. NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED (unduplicated count) 217 18-22
H. HOURS OF STUDENT EXPOSURE PER WEEK, to the nearest hour (times G) 4 hrs.	I. INSTRUCTION/PUPIL RATIO (expressed as decimal) 6-1 30-31	J. TOTAL PROJECT COST (omit cents) $87,457.00 32-37	K. COST PER PUPIL (J divided by G) $403.02

TEST RESULTS

GRADE	TEST	NAME, LEVEL AND FORM OF TEST	TEST CODE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN TAKING TEST	DATE OF TEST	MEAN STANDARD SCORE	MEAN PERCENTILE SCORE	MEAN GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORE	GRADE EQUIVALENT GAIN
			14	18	33	20	32	38	
1	PRE	Stanford Diagnostic Math.						0.7	+1.5
	POST	" "						2.2	
2	PRE	" "						2.1	+1.5
	POST	" "						3.6	
3	PRE	" "						2.2	+2.7
	POST	" "						4.9	
4	PRE	" "						3.2	+1.0
	POST	" "						4.2	
	PRE								
	POST								
	PRE								
	POST								
	PRE								
	POST								
	PRE								
	POST								
	PRE								
	POST								
	PRE								
	POST								
	PRE								
	POST								
	PRE								
	POST								